



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/751,539 | 01/06/2004 | Gregory Sidebottom | 0023-0180 | 3312 |
| 44987 | 7590 | 01/17/2008 | | |
| HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030 | | | EXAMINER SOL, ANTHONY M | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2619 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 01/17/2008 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/751,539

Applicant(s)

SIDEBOTTOM ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony Sol

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,8-12,16,18,20-24,26-29,31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,8-12,16,18,20-24,26-29,31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 10/30/2007 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16, 18, 20-24, 26, and 31, have been amended.
- Claims 3-7, 13-15, 17, 19, 25, 30, and 32 have been canceled.
- Claims 33-35 have been added.
- Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-29, 31, and 33-35 remain pending.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

For claim 34, line 1, it is believed that the phrase, "The system of claim 31" should state --The method of claim 31-- since claim 31 is a method claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 8-12, 16, 20-24, 26-29, 31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No. US 2003/0139174 A1 ("Rao") in view of US 2003/0220872 A1 ("Chandrashekhar").

Regarding claim 1,

Rao shows in figs. 1, 2, and 9 service activation component 201, 202, 203 offering the extensible set of services 1200, 1300, 1400, 1500 (para. 9, *The CSP system advantageously enables a communications system to be quickly offered to market in conjunction with **value-added services** through applications rendered by third party service providers; para. 37, a simplistic change in the module utilizing a dynamically configurable matrix advantageously allows different percentages to be entered, where the changed module thereafter will provide the desired result*).

Regarding claim 8,

Rao shows in figs. 1, 2, and 9 service provider system connected to a plurality of business partner systems 31 associated with a corresponding plurality of business partners, each of the business partners selling services 1200, 1300, 1400, 1500 of an extensible set of services provided by the service provider system 210 (para. 9, *The CSP system advantageously enables a communications system to be quickly offered to market in conjunction with value-added services through applications rendered by third party service providers; para. 37, a simplistic change in the module utilizing a dynamically configurable matrix advantageously allows different percentages to be*

*entered, where the changed module thereafter will provide the desired result), to its customers 20, 21, the service provider system 210 providing a common interface 1600 via which the business partner systems request one or more services from the extensible set of services, the service provider system 210 exposing subsets of the common interface to each of the business partner systems 31 by controlling access to the extensible set of services by the business partner systems (para. 9, *The CSP system advantageously enables a communications system to be quickly offered to market in conjunction with value-added services through applications rendered by third party service providers; para. 37, a simplistic change in the module utilizing a dynamically configurable matrix advantageously allows different percentages to be entered, where the changed module thereafter will provide the desired result; para. 85, For **access control**, the CSP system according to the invention allows administration of access rules within a plurality of applications, and supports multiple user classes or groups, each having access to different functionalities and data; para. 85, For **authentication**, a user ID or password...will be required for authenticating Internet end users for accessing the common service platform).**

Regarding claims 9, 10, and 11,

Rao discloses that the service activation component includes a plurality of service activation components 201, 202, 203 and wherein the system further comprises a SAE locator, *an application profile of application registration service 180*, configured to obtain information associated with the service activation components (para. 45, *the*

ability to register an application and make it available for user subscription. An application profile is maintained, acting as an information nexus for applications. The application profile will include, e.g., application identifiers... The Application registration service 180 is readily available for end users subscribing to internal applications, third party applications, or third party application), and wherein the gateway CSP 12 is further configured to receive a message requesting one of the services (para. 57, The client layer 1100 according to this invention comprises a plurality of client devices, which end users use in accessing CSP services), and contact the SAE locator to identify one of the service activation components 201, 202, 203 on which to activate the requested service.

Regarding claims 12, 22, and 27,

Rao discloses for authentication, a user ID or password...will be required for authenticating Internet end users for accessing the common service platform (para. 85).

Rao further discloses firewall service (para. 85).

Regarding claims 16, 21, 23, 24, 31, and 33-35,

Rao shows in figs. 1, 2, 4 and 9 a service gateway 12 in communication with a first entity 30 and a second entity 13, the service gateway comprising a first interface 1100 module to receive, from the first entity, a message requesting performance of a service in an extensible set of services (para. 9, *value-added services*) offered by the second entity (Abstract, *Requests for uses in different communications system are*

*transferred to the CSP for conversion into generally the same format that is acceptable by a selected application; para. 57, **The client layer 1100** according to this invention comprises a plurality of client devices, **which end users use in accessing CSP services**).*

Rao further shows in fig. 9 an access control module 1600 to make a first determination of whether the first entity 30 is permitted to request performance of the service and a second interface module 1200 to selectively request performance of the service by the second entity 13 (para. 85, *For access control, the CSP system according to the invention allows administration of access rules within a plurality of applications, and supports multiple user classes or groups, each having access to different functionalities and data; para. 60, Personalization services will maintain and provide information for different users. Profile services can also be extended to provide services for holding permissible client preferences. Web page presentation for different end users or client devices can accordingly be generated based on the personalization information*).

Rao does not explicitly disclose that the message includes a service name that corresponds to the service, an argument that includes data useful in performing the service, and makes a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and further makes a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name.

Chandrashekhhar discloses that the EU submits a request for selected service(s)/applications(s). The information indicative of the requested services/applications (claimed ***first determination*** and ***service name***) and associated attributes (customization features) are referred to as an application request (AR; claimed ***second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided*** and ***third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested***). The AR is received by the system 100 at step 62 (para. 31). Chandrashekhhar further discloses that an authorized EU may customize an AR with predefined parameters (claimed ***argument***)(para. 32).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the common service platform and software of Rao to provide a capability to provide access based on the message received that includes service(s)/application(s) and associated attributes as taught by Chandrashekhhar. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination since a unique identifier and associated information is needed for end-user identification and authentication (Rao, para. 41).

Regarding claim 20,

Rao discloses unique identifier and associated information needed for end-user identification and authentication (Rao, para. 41). The end-use can be a business partners using business value-added services 740 (para. 35).

Regarding claims 26, 28, 29,

Rao shows in figs. 1, 2, 4 and 9 a service activation component 201, 202, and 203, configured to provide services to the subscribers 20, 21 and a service gateway 1600 configured to act as a single point of contact between the retailer systems 210 and the service activation component 201, 202, 203, the service gateway 1600 providing controlled access, by the retailer systems 210, to the services 1200, 1300, 1400, 1500 provided by the service activation component 201, 202, 203, the service gateway 1600 permitting each of the retailer systems 210 access to a subset of the services 1200, 1300, 1400, 1500 provided by the service activation component via the controlled access (para. 9, *The CSP system advantageously enables a communications system to be quickly offered to market in conjunction with value-added services through applications rendered by third party service providers; para. 37, a simplistic change in the module utilizing a dynamically configurable matrix advantageously allows different percentages to be entered, where the changed module thereafter will provide the desired result; para. 85, For **access control**, the CSP system according to the invention allows administration of access rules within a plurality of applications, and supports multiple user classes or groups, each having access to different functionalities and data).*

Rao further shows in fig. 9 the service gateway comprising a first interface module 1100 to receive, from one of the retailer systems, a message requesting

performance of one of the services by the service activation component (Abstract, *Requests for uses in different communications system are transferred to the CSP for conversion into generally the same format that is acceptable by a selected application;* para. 57, ***The client layer 1100** according to this invention comprises a plurality of client devices, **which end users use in accessing CSP services***), an access control module 1600 to make a first determination of whether the one retailer system 30 is permitted to request performance of the one service and a second interface module 1200 to selectively interact with the service activation component.

Rao does not disclose that the message includes at least one argument that includes data useful for performing the one service, make a second determination of whether the at least one argument is permissible for the one retailer system, and make a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the one service.

Chandrashekhhar discloses that the EU submits a request for selected service(s)/applications(s). The information indicative of the requested services/applications (claimed ***first determination*** and ***service name***) and associated attributes (customization features) are referred to as an application request (AR; claimed ***second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided*** and ***third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested***). The AR is received by the system 100 at step 62 (para. 31). Chandrashekhhar further discloses that an authorized EU may customize an AR with predefined parameters (claimed ***argument***)(para. 32).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the common service platform and software of Rao to provide a capability to provide access based on the message received that includes service(s)/application(s) and associated attributes as taught by Chandrashekhar. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination since a unique identifier and associated information is needed for end-user identification and authentication (Rao, para. 41).

4. Claims 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao in view of Chandrashekhar, and further in view of US 2003/0055968 A1 ("Hochmuth").

Regarding claims 2 and 18,

Rao and Chandrashekhar do not explicitly disclose that the activation component is configured to configure a router to deliver a service.

Hochmuth discloses reconfiguration may also involve steps such as, but not limited to, configuring network devices to move a port on which network resource 42 is connected from one cell to another, configuring a router's access control list (ACL) and/or other parameters (para. 44).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the common service platform and software of Rao to provide a capability to provide router configuration service as taught by

Hochmuth. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination to permit or deny access to network resource 42 through any network connection, and/or configuring a firewall (Hochmuth, para. 44).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - The Applicant argues on page 18 that Chandrashekhar does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that makes a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, makes a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and makes a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name, as recited in claim 23 and similarly for other independent claims 26, 31, and 35.
 - The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As detailed in the rejection to claim 23, Chandrashekhar discloses that the EU submits a request for selected service(s)/applications(s). The information indicative of the requested services/applications (claimed ***first determination*** and ***service name***) and associated attributes (customization features) are referred to as an application request (AR; claimed ***second determination of whether the argument is permitted to by provided*** and ***third determination of whether***

the argument is permitted to be requested). The AR is received by the system 100 at step 62 (para. 31). Chandrashekar further discloses that an authorized EU may customize an AR with predefined parameters (claimed *argument*)(para. 32).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Sol whose telephone number is (571) 272-5949. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 4pm.

Application/Control Number:
10/751,539
Art Unit: 2619

Page 13

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WING CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AMS

1/15/2008